REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action dated December 26, 2007 (the "Office Action"). Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16-20, 22 and 24-26 are pending in the application. Claims 7, 9, and 23 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 6, 8, 10, and 12 have been amended. Claims 24-26 have been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the claim amendments and new claims may be found in at least paragraphs 0022, 0023, 0034, 0038, 0040, 0047 and 0052 of the application.

Claims 12, 13 and 16-20 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 12, 13, and 16-20 at paragraph 5 of the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 12 is directed to statutory subject matter in accordance with § 101, as the claim is tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable (i.e., stored on a computer readable storage medium). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that that Office withdraw the § 101 rejection of claim 12.

Claims 13 and 16-20 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that that Office withdraw the § 101 rejections of claims 13 and 16-20.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-9, at paragraph 7 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over "Microsoft Office XP Inside Out" ("Halverson"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,481 ("Michelman"). Claims 7 and 9 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully traverse the remainder of the rejections.

The cited portions of Halverson and Michelman, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Halverson and Michelman fail to disclose or suggest storing a custom search, where the custom search enables execution of a predetermined search, where the predetermined search includes a

search of a subset of rows and columns of a spreadsheet, as in claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Halverson describe consolidating worksheets with identical formats. *See* Halverson, pp. 689-693. Applicants respectfully submit that consolidating worksheets with identical formats does not teach a <u>search</u> of a subset of rows and columns of a spreadsheet. Therefore, the cited portions of Halverson fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1.

Further, the cited portions of Michelman fail to disclose or suggest storing a custom search, where the custom search enables execution of a predetermined search, where the predetermined search includes a search of a <u>subset</u> of rows and columns of a spreadsheet, as in claim 1. Instead, Michelman is directed to improving readability of formulas within a spreadsheet. *See* Michelman, col. 1, lines 35-36. In Michelman, a formula is parsed in order to identify any label references within the formula; and the cells of the spreadsheet are searched in order to generate a list of labels within the spreadsheet that match the label references identified in the formula. *See* Michelman, col. 1, lines 61-66. The Office asserts that "the functions and the labels in the functions are created by a user, and are therefore custom." *See* Office Action, p. 10. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portions of Michelman describe searching an <u>entire spreadsheet</u> to identify label references. By contrast, claim 1 discloses storing a custom search, where the custom search enables execution of a predetermined search, where the predetermined search includes a search of a <u>subset</u> of rows and columns of a spreadsheet. Therefore, the cited portions of Michelman fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1.

Therefore, the cited portions of Halverson and Michelman, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 depend from claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1. Further, the dependent claims include additional features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Halverson and Michelman.

For example, claim 8 discloses <u>automatically</u> appending additional data to the final report spreadsheet, wherein the additional data is not within the plurality of spreadsheets. The Office

asserts that "Halverson discloses that additional data not found in the selected spreadsheets may also be appended to the final report spreadsheet." *See* Office Action, p. 5. Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion. The cited portions of Halverson describe adding headings to a blank worksheet. *See* Halverson, p. 695. Further, adding headings is a <u>manual</u> process, as described by Halverson in the context of a tutorial on the use of the 'Consolidate' command within Microsoft Excel. Therefore, the cited portions of Halverson fail to disclose or suggest <u>automatically</u> appending additional data to the final report spreadsheet, wherein the additional data is not within the plurality of spreadsheets, as in claim 8. Further, the cited portions of Michelman fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 8. Instead, Michelman is directed to improving readability of formulas within a spreadsheet. *See* Michelman, col. 1, lines 35-36. Therefore, the cited portions of Halverson and Michelman, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 8. For this additional reason, claim 8 is also allowable.

Claims 10, 12, 13, 16-18, 20 and 22 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 10, 12, 13, 16-18, 20, 22, and 23, at paragraph 8 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Halverson in view of Michelman, further in view of "Advanced Excel Find" ("AEF"). Claim 23 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully traverse the remainder of the rejections.

The cited portions of Halverson, Michelman, and AEF, individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 10. For example, the cited portions of Halverson, Michelman, and AEF fail to disclose or suggest a computer readable medium encoded with computer executable instructions to generate a final report that includes the first and second portions of data and <u>workbook names</u> designating where the first and second portions of data were originally located, as in claim 10. In contrast to claim 10, the cited portions of Halverson describe consolidating worksheets with identical formats. *See* Halverson, pp. 689-693. Applicants respectfully submit that consolidating worksheets with identical formats does not teach generating a final report that includes the first and second portions of data and <u>workbook names</u> designating where the first and second portions of data were originally located. Therefore, the cited portions of Halverson fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 10.

Further, the cited portions of Michelman fail to disclose or suggest a computer readable medium encoded with computer executable instructions to generate a final report that includes the first and second portions of data and workbook names designating where the first and second portions of data were originally located, as in claim 10. Instead, Michelman is directed to improving readability of formulas within a spreadsheet. *See* Michelman, col. 1, lines 35-36. In Michelman, a formula is parsed in order to identify any label references within the formula and the cells of the spreadsheet are searched in order to generate a list of labels within the spreadsheet that match the label references identified in the formula. *See* Michelman, col. 1, lines 61-66. Applicants respectfully submit that searching an entire spreadsheet to identify label references does not teach generating reports including workbook names designating where the data were originally located. Therefore, the cited portions of Michelman fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 10.

Further, the cited portions of AEF fail to disclose or suggest a computer readable medium encoded with computer executable instructions to generate a final report that includes the first and second portions of data and workbook names designating where the first and second portions of data were originally located, as in claim 10. Instead, AEF describes an "Advanced Excel Find" add-in for Microsoft Excel, which allows a user to avoid having to "click *Find Next* and *repeat it time and again.*" *See* AEF, p. 1 (Emphasis in Original). Applicants respectfully submit that this advanced find command for Microsoft Excel does not include the ability to generate a final report that includes the first and second portions of data and workbook names designating where the first and second portions of data were originally located. Therefore, the cited portions of AEF fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 10.

Therefore, the cited portions of Halverson, Michelman and AEF, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 10. Hence, claim 10 is allowable.

Claim 22 depends from claim 10, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, claim 22 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 10. Further, claim 22 discloses computer readable instructions that allow a user to define a predefined search. The cited portions of Halverson, Michelman, and AEF, individually or in combination, fail to

disclose or suggest this feature of claim 22. For this additional reason, claim 22 is also allowable.

The cited portions of Halverson, Michelman and AEF, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the specific combination of claim 12. For example, the cited portions of Halverson fail to disclose or suggest a controller adapted to append spreadsheet names identifying sources of the desired portions of data to the final report spreadsheet, as in claim 12. In contrast to claim 12, Halverson describes consolidating worksheets with identical formats. *See* Halverson, pp. 689-693. Applicants respectfully submit that consolidating worksheets with identical formats does not teach appending spreadsheet names identifying sources of the desired portions of data to the final report spreadsheet. Therefore, the cited portions of Halverson fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 12.

Further, the cited portions of Michelman fail to disclose or suggest a controller adapted to append spreadsheet names identifying sources of the desired portions of data to the final report spreadsheet, as in claim 12. Instead, Michelman is directed to improving readability of formulas within a spreadsheet. *See* Michelman, col. 1, lines 35-36. In Michelman, a formula is parsed in order to identify any label references within the formula; and the cells of the spreadsheet are searched in order to generate a list of labels within the spreadsheet that match the label references identified in the formula. *See* Michelman, col. 1, lines 61-66. Applicants respectfully submit that searching an entire spreadsheet to identify label references does not teach appending spreadsheet names identifying sources of the desired portions of data to the final report spreadsheet. Therefore, the cited portions of Michelman fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 12.

Further, the cited portions of AEF fail to disclose or suggest a controller adapted to append spreadsheet names identifying sources of the desired portions of data to the final report spreadsheet, as in claim 12. Instead, the cited portions of AEF describe an "Advanced Excel Find" add-in for Microsoft Excel, allowing a user to avoid having to "click *Find Next* and *repeat it time and again.*" *See* AEF, p. 1 (Emphasis in Original). Applicants respectfully submit that this advanced find command for Microsoft Excel does not include appending spreadsheet names

identifying sources of the desired portions of data to the final report spreadsheet. Therefore, the cited portions of AEF fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 12.

Therefore, the cited portions of Halverson, Michelman, and AEF, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 12. Hence, claim 12 is allowable.

Claims 13, 16-18 and 20 depend from claim 12, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, claims 13, 16-18 and 20 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 12. Further, the dependent claims include additional features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Halverson and Michelman. For example, claim 18 discloses a graphical control panel that includes a status indicator. The cited portions of Halverson, Michelman, and AEF, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 18. For this additional reason, claim 18 is also allowable.

Claim 19 is Allowable

The Office has rejected claim 19, at paragraph 9 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Halverson, in view of AEF, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0061193 ("Anson"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 19 depends from claim 12. As explained above, the cited portions of Halverson and AEF fail to disclose or suggest at least one element of claim 12. The cited portions of Anson do not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 12 not disclosed by the cited portions of Halverson and AEF. For example, the cited portions of Anson fail to disclose or suggest a controller adapted to append spreadsheet names identifying sources of the desired portions of data to the final report spreadsheet, as in claim 12. In contrast to claim 12, Anson describes filtering a data set to identify lines of interest. *See* Anson, Abstract. Thus, the cited portions of Halverson, AEF, and Anson, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 12, or of claim 19, which depends from claim 12. Hence, claim 19 is allowable.

Claims 24-26 are Allowable

Claims 24-25 depend from claim 8, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, claims 24-25 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 8. Further, the dependent claims include additional features that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited portions of Halverson and Michelman. For example, claim 24 discloses appending workbook names to designate where the portions of data were originally located. The cited portions of Halverson and Michelman fail to disclose or suggest appending workbook names to designate where the portions of data were originally located, as in claim 24. For this additional reason, claim 24 is also allowable.

Claim 26 depends from claim 12, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, claim 26 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 12. Therefore, the cited portions of Halverson, Michelman, and AEF, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 26. For this additional reason, claim 26 is also allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the cited art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

U.S. App. No.: 10/604,608

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

_3-26-2008_
Date

Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicants
Toler Law Group, Intellectual Properties
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)